

6. Regional Consultation: Summary of Sub-regional Views and Responses

This section outlines the key sub-regional issues raised through regional consultation on the draft South East Plan (January-April 2005). The Assembly’s planning team have summarised main issues and the sub-region’s response, drawing on analysis carried out by the region’s principal authorities.

6.1 South Hampshire Sub-regional Strategy

Summary of consultation responses drawn from detailed analysis undertaken by Hampshire County Council

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Vision, Overall Strategy, and Scale & Distribution of Growth	Overall support for the vision and for a sustainable economic and regeneration-led strategy, a focus on the cities and towns and an emphasis on use of previously developed land. A range of views on the appropriate level of housing growth	This approach is central to the overall aims of the South Hampshire sub-regional strategy. Policy SH1 revised to reflect the support for the overall strategy. The level of housing growth to be provided in South Hampshire is set in the regional section of the South East Plan. It is also the figure that has been identified in technical work by the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) as necessary to support the economic strategy for the sub-region. Delivering economic growth will improve the quality of life in South Hampshire
	Support for the importance attached to infrastructure provision, but some concern that existing problems need to be addressed and that adequate funding needs to be made available	A detailed schedule of transport and other infrastructure requirements is being developed to support the sub-regional strategy. This is included in the draft Sub-Regional Investment Framework (see Implementation Plan). Development in South Hampshire will be determined by, and be conditional on, the rate of infrastructure investment
	A range of views on the concept of Strategic Development Areas (SDAs), with some respondents arguing that the policy should be deleted or is premature, and others that the SDAs should be located in particular areas or that certain factors should be given greater weight in determining the approach to SDAs	PUSH believes that the SDA approach is the most sustainable way of delivering greenfield development. PUSH has identified two potential SDAs and is continuing to develop its approach
Strategic Gaps	Strong support for the identification/retention of strategic gaps	The sub-regional strategy includes a new policy on sub-regional gaps
Implementation	A range of views on the proposed implementation agency, with some arguing that such an agency is not necessary/ appropriate, and others that it is vital	A dedicated vehicle is required to set priorities, deal with cross-boundary issues and to ensure that the overall strategy is implemented
	Support for the ‘plan, monitor and manage’ approach	‘Plan, monitor and manage’ is an essential tool to ensure that the different elements of the strategy are delivered in a co-ordinated and timely fashion

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Economy and Employment	General support for the overall approach, but with a range of views as to the area of land that will be required to support the planned level of economic growth. Support for the emphasis on skills	Policy SH6 has been revised to refer to floorspace requirements, to allow for differing development densities on different sites
Town Centres	Support for the broad approach, focused on Portsmouth, Southampton and other large town centres. The policy should distinguish between city and large town centres	Work to develop a policy for city and town centres is on-going and will be submitted at a later stage in the Plan process
Communications and Transport	A number of respondents suggested that the sub-regional strategy should identify particular projects, measures or interventions. A range of opinions as to the best ways to tackle congestion and service new development, but support for a more visionary approach and significant new investment	Policy SH10 has been revised. In addition, a detailed schedule of transport and other infrastructure requirements is being developed to support the sub-regional strategy. This is included in the draft Sub-Regional Investment Framework (see Implementation Plan). Development will be determined by, and be conditional on, the rate of infrastructure investment
Housing	<p>Strong support for the priority attached to affordable housing. A range of views expressed on the target</p> <p>Concern that new homes should be more environmentally friendly</p>	<p>The importance attached to affordable housing is reflected in Policy SH13. The target of 30-40% identified in the sub-regional strategy is based on recent research</p> <p>A new policy has been introduced (Policy SH14) related to environmental sustainability, with clear requirements for sustainable construction in new housing development</p>
Sustainable Natural Resources	Concern that further development will have a negative impact on the environment, particularly water supplies. A number of respondents suggested that there should be a policy that seeks to enhance the environment and quality of life to underpin and support the growth strategy	An assessment has been made of the likely environmental impact of the development proposed. This shows that the impacts would be acceptable. In addition, a new policy has been introduced (Policy SH14) related to environmental sustainability. Water companies have been consulted and have advised that the water required can be supplied and waste water treated
Countryside	Strong support that the boundary of the sub-region respects that of the proposed South Downs National Park	No change required

6.2 Sussex Coast Sub-regional Strategy

Summary of consultation responses drawn from detailed analysis undertaken by East Sussex County Council

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Core Strategy and Scale, Location and Type of Housing	<p>There was strong debate over the level of housing needed within the sub-region. Whilst some comments promoted more or less development than suggested, the arguments regarding the constraints on the sub-region appear to lead to overall support for the growth level and direction promoted in the sub-regional strategy</p> <p>Core strategy was supported. Some confusion over exemption policy for employment land</p> <p>Concern overall for delivery of infrastructure to support existing and future development, and design quality</p>	<p>The strategy seeks to address the deficits of the sub-region, particularly in relation to regenerating the economy in the area. This is a difficult balance in regard to the environmental and other constraints in the area. The approach for dispersed development matches best these competing demands</p> <p>SCT 8 has been revised to clarify any exemption policy (see below), supporting text also revised</p> <p>See comments below. Issues of design are now addressed in revised regional policy</p>
Affordable Housing	Support for high levels of affordable housing, and mixed tenure. Concern that targets however may not be delivered, deterring development and increasing the price of market housing	Policy SCT8 includes a target of at least 40% to help meet the significant need for affordable housing in the sub-region. District councils will determine amounts to be provided locally. Supporting text amplified to address concerns
Economy	The majority of the comments regarding the economy were supportive or seeking greater clarification in the text. The tension between economic regeneration and environmental protection are clear (see below). Linkages between economy and transport are also made. Some tension between the relative regeneration needs of the sub-region as a whole, versus the needs for selected areas. There is support for the need to focus on economic development as the key policy driver, but recognition of the difficulty in addressing this. Skills and joint working with agencies is also supported	The sub-regional policy framework has been solidified, and based upon the direction set out in section C of the Plan. Tensions between environment and economy are present and are addressed below. Additional supporting text has been included to assist with the regeneration objectives and imperative for economic growth, and also to address the differential approaches needed across the sub-region
Environmental and Landscape Protection	There is concern that the issues of the potential creation of a new National Park affecting the sub-region have not been fully addressed. Likewise there is concern over policy SCT4 that creates an exception policy for the potential for limited encroachment into the AONB to be considered. Concern over flood plains and other environmental constraints also feature. The tension between economic and environmental need is clear in the divided nature of the responses	Policy C1b has been created which addresses the potential development of a new National Park in the South Downs area. The wording of policy SCT4 has been tightened and supporting text reinforces that any exception is for 'consideration' by the LDF where detailed assessment will need to be undertaken. This issue would have to be addressed in light of regional and national policy by the LDF. Other policy issues are addressed in regional or national policy or will be by the LDF

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Transport and Infrastructure	Transport and infrastructure provision was a major concern of respondents. Concerns centred on inadequate infrastructure especially the east-west corridor (eg A27/A259 and coastway rail services) within the sub-region, and corridors linking the sub-region north-south (eg Lewes Uckfield Line and A21). Specific references were made to the need to address current demands, and that further housing and economic growth will increase pressure. There is consensus over the need for timely provision of infrastructure. Some debate over additional transport hubs in the sub-region. Concern that the whole package of infrastructure provision is made (ie hospitals, schools etc) and not just transport	A detailed schedule of transport and other infrastructure requirements has been developed to support the sub-regional strategy. This is included in the draft Sub-regional Investment Framework (see Implementation Plan). Policy SCT9 requires infrastructure provision in time to meet demands of population. Hastings has been designated a new regional hub under Policy CC8b

6.3 East Kent and Ashford Sub-regional Strategy

Summary of consultation responses drawn from detailed analysis undertaken by Kent County Council

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Core Strategy and Scale, Location and Type of Housing	<p>Support from different interests for both option 1 (the dwelling provision in the Kent and Medway Structure Plan extended through to 2026) and option 2 (a total approximately 25% higher than option 1).</p> <p>Varied opinions about whether development should be distributed evenly among urban areas or concentrated at Dover</p> <p>A number of comments supported building only on brownfield and not greenfield land</p>	<p>The scale of development was resolved by the decisions of the Assembly in July 2005 and is close to the first of the options presented for consultation the draft Plan</p> <p>The preferred spatial strategy is for a dispersed pattern of growth and further investigation of the accommodation of additional development at Dover</p> <p>The strategy is for priority to be given to regeneration through the use of previously developed land before greenfield sites are developed</p>
Affordable Housing	Comments received that parts of the sub-region were suffering a severe lack of affordable housing and that the 30% target would not meet the needs of the area	Policy EKA2 includes a target for 30% and scope for local variation, which is judged to be the practical level for the policy by the local housing authorities
Economy	Comments received included the need to address unemployment before new homes were built, the need for a mechanism to quantify and deliver economic success, the need to address regeneration at the coast and the need to diversify the Ashford local economy away from reliance on low value-added industries	Policy EKA3 provides a strategy for increasing employment and the supporting text includes a figure for monitoring future changes in employment. Policy EKA4 addresses the need for urban renaissance of the coastal towns and Policy EKA3 identifies the best way to achieve a diversification in the local economy at Ashford

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Transport and Infrastructure	Transport and infrastructure provision was a major concern of respondents. Concern centred on road and public transport improvements required to support development eg improvements to the M2/M20, dualling the A2 from Lydden to Dover and the A2-M2 link west of Faversham, as well as the need to move more freight to rail. Concerns over water shortage, need for more water treatment and that development should not take place in areas at high risk of flooding	A detailed schedule of transport and other infrastructure requirements has been developed to support the sub-regional strategy. This is included in the draft Sub-regional Investment Framework (see Implementation Plan). Policy EKA10 requires infrastructure provision in time to support growth
The Gateway Role	Comments included the need for investment to resolve access problems to the Port of Dover, the need for port trade to be promoted at the Port of Ramsgate and that a second fixed cross channel link would not be viable	Policy EKA5 addresses these concerns stating support for appropriate development of the Port of Dover rail access as a condition of development outside the harbour, the need for proposals to assist growth at the Port of Ramsgate and setting out broad criteria for the evaluation of a second fixed cross channel link should a new proposal come forward

6.4 Kent Thames Gateway Sub-regional Strategy

Summary of consultation responses drawn from detailed analysis undertaken by Kent County Council

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Core Strategy and Scale, Location and Type of Housing	<p>A range of opinions about the scale of development. Some concerned over a lack of commitment if option 3 (58,200 dwellings 2001-2026) is chosen and therefore option 2 (77,400 dwellings 2001-2026) seen as preferable if infrastructure is in place. However, option 3 also seen as the only sustainable option. Option 1 (71,700 dwellings 2001-2026) and option 2 seen to conflict with the sustainable communities plan</p> <p>A number of comments received stated that development on greenfield sites should be prevented and a number mentioned specific areas where there should not be development eg Hoo Peninsula</p>	<p>The scale of development was resolved by the decisions of the Assembly in July 2005 and equates to the lower option 3 of the consultation draft plan</p> <p>The scale of development proposed requires little new green land and the strategy sets out that brownfield sites should be developed first. At the Hoo Peninsula the scale of development proposed will require releases of MoD land at Chattenden and the use of allocated employment and energy sites</p>

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Green Belt and Countryside and Landscape Management	<p>Some respondents did not support any options that required development of the Green Belt, while others considered that a strategic review of the Green Belt was overdue</p> <p>A few comments received stated that there should be a separate policy covering green initiatives and that it should integrate the proposals for enhancement of the countryside around north Kent into the Plan</p>	<p>Policy KTG3 states the need to protect the Green Belt from development</p> <p>Policy KTG10 is included, which sets out the mechanisms for taking forward “Greening the Gateway” in North Kent</p>
Affordable Housing	<p>Comment that the 40% target for affordable housing did not seem practical</p>	<p>Policy KTG2 includes a target for 30% and scope for local variation</p>
Economy	<p>Comments received included that insufficient work was available in the sub-region to sustain an increased population, lack of employment is forcing residents to commute further to find work and that because local business estates were not in full use no more should be built</p>	<p>Policies KTG4, 5 and 6 provide a strategy for increasing employment and reducing dependence on jobs outside the sub-region</p>
Transport and Infrastructure	<p>Transport and infrastructure provision was a major concern of respondents. Concern that local infrastructure is struggling under the weight of existing levels of development and will not be able to cope with any additional development. The scale of development requires significant investment in public transport and the highways infrastructure, and development must not be delayed by phasing of infrastructure. Comments include support for specific schemes eg the extension of Crossrail to Ebbsfleet, the A2 Bean Junction and the M25 Junction 1b-3 widening. Concerns over water shortage, need for more water treatment and adding to flood risk</p>	<p>A detailed schedule of transport and other infrastructure requirements has been developed to support the sub-regional strategy. This is included in the draft Sub-regional Investment Framework (see Implementation Plan). Policy KTG12 requires infrastructure provision in time to support growth</p>
Cross-regional Links	<p>Some respondents questioned the assumptions about increasing labour market self sufficiency and job growth aspirations, given increased commuting capacity from CTRL and the release of employment land in London. Comments that Kent Thames Gateway could not be looked at in isolation from the rest of the Gateway</p>	<p>Policy KTG5 seeks to provide land and premises for business and other employment uses for each urban area to match the growth in housing and labour supply and promote self sufficiency. The need for partners in Kent Thames Gateway to work with partners in the London and Essex parts of the Gateway will be actioned through the Implementation Plan</p>
Zone of Influence and Rest of Kent	<p>Comments that the zone of influence is misleading and concern that it could act as an overspill to accommodate the Gateway’s growth rate</p> <p>Concern that the policies do not provide a vision for Tonbridge or coherent growth plan for Maidstone</p>	<p>The maps have been revised to delete the zone of influence boundary and policy KTG11 has been renamed</p> <p>Policy CC8c includes a clear strategy for Tonbridge-Tunbridge Wells and Maidstone</p>

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
The Role of the Retail Centres	<p>Support for limited additional floorspace at Bluewater reflecting its regional retail role and development of retail and service space at Ebbsfleet to serve the resident and day-time population. However comments received objecting to the designation of Bluewater/Ebbsfleet as a town centre in policy TC2</p>	<p>Bluewater/Ebbsfleet is designated as a town centre based on the potential for combined development of retail/service space at Ebbsfleet, regional retail space at Bluewater and housing development at Eastern Quarry. Policy TC2 and KTG8 are consistent, with TC2 defining the regional network of town centres and deferring the specification of the role of the retail centres to KTG8</p>

6.5 London Fringe Sub-regional Strategy

Summary of consultation responses drawn from detailed analysis undertaken by Surrey County Council

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Core Strategy and Spatial Options	<p>Most respondents felt that increases in housing numbers in the sub-region beyond that already being achieved was unsustainable, although a minority took an opposing view that there was a need for a significantly greater number of homes</p> <p>Most respondents felt that an urban focus for development was correct for this sub-region</p> <p>Some comments also emphasised the need to work closely with partners in London in recognition of the inter-relationships between the two areas</p>	<p>It was felt that maintaining a level of housing growth similar to that currently planned was the most appropriate approach for this sub-region given the demand for growth, but also the constraints that exist in the sub-region</p> <p>The urban focused approach seems the most appropriate way forward in this sub-region given the constraints of Green Belt</p> <p>The Plan already contains references to these important inter-linkages, and some joint working is underway, and this will need to be maintained and developed during the life of the Plan</p>
Green Belt	<p>Some respondents felt that more recognition was required in the strategy, not only of the opportunities but also the constraints that arise from the Green Belt in the sub-region</p>	<p>The opportunities are addressed by a policy specific to this issue, and the constraints are addressed implicitly in the sub-region’s core strategy and spatial approach</p>
Greenfield Land	<p>The majority of respondents’ comments on this issue emphasised that greenfield land release was not acceptable and would divert attention away from previously developed land. However some challenged this view and said that it was necessary to enable development to meet the needs of the area in a more sustainable way</p>	<p>It was felt right that the emphasis in this sub-region should be on previously developed land, given the importance and extent of the Green Belt, and that solutions would have to be found within this context to ensure the needs of the area are met in a sustainable way</p>
Affordable Housing	<p>Respondents highlighted the need for more affordable housing in the sub-region</p>	<p>This is fully supported, and a policy is included to seek to address the issue</p>

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Economy	Respondents highlighted the importance of maintaining the sub-region's economy, although some added that this must not be at the cost of environmental quality and protection of the Green Belt. Some also noted that there was a need to clarify the extent to which economic growth would be pursued in the sub-region	The importance of growing the economy in a sustainable way is covered in the core strategy
Transport and Infrastructure	Many respondents emphasised the need to ensure that infrastructure improvements were made either in advance or in tandem with other development. Particular comments were made around the issues of water supply and traffic congestion	The issue of infrastructure is a critical one for the Plan as a whole, and further work will be undertaken over summer 2006 to develop a detailed sub-regional investment framework for each sub-region
Environmental Considerations	Respondents highlighted the importance of urban green space	This is acknowledged and addressed in policies within the Plan
Geographic Extent of the Sub-region	A number of comments were received that questioned the geography of the sub-region, and identified areas that should be excluded from the boundary due to environmental or policy constraints affecting those areas	The boundaries were established to address policy deficits or particular sub-regional needs, and the current boundary has been extensively considered and is felt appropriate

6.6 Western Corridor Sub-regional Strategy

Summary of consultation responses drawn from detailed analysis undertaken by the sub-regional group

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Location of Development	<p>General support for urban focus. Considerable concern expressed about pressure on greenbelt and nationally protected landscapes, and the need to protect these areas. Also concern that sizeable releases of greenfield land would be necessitated by development proposals, and additional pressure would be put on land within the floodplain</p> <p>Some representations expressed the view that Green Belt boundaries should be reviewed in the light of development pressures</p>	<p>The strategy seeks to minimise the take of greenfield and rural land. Regional and sub-regional hubs will be the main focus for development (revised Policy WCBV1); however in some cases small scale sustainable urban extensions may be brought forward through Local Development Documents</p> <p>Policy WCBV2 clearly sets out that urban extensions should not involve incursions into areas protected by Green Belt, AONBs or any other environmental or planning policies of regional, national, or international importance. The Regional Assembly has taken a view that there is no scope for a regional review of Green Belt</p>

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Sub-regional Boundaries	A number of requests for exclusion of areas from the sub-region; also some views expressed that the Blackwater Valley should be a separate sub-region	<p>These requests were considered at the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) on 23 June 2005.</p> <p>Farnham was removed from the sub-region. Following this meeting and further RPC discussions on 27 July 2005, and between the Chair of the sub-regional group and Assembly Head of Spatial Planning, further amendments were made to the southern boundary of the sub-region</p> <p>On 1 March 2006, the Assembly agreed to redraw the boundary of the sub-region to exclude the small part of South Oxfordshire district that was previously included</p>
Infrastructure	<p>Concerns expressed about existing pressures on infrastructure (including roads, public transport, water supply and treatment, schools and hospitals) and that pressures will only increase in the future, as well as the detrimental impact this could have on quality of life and economic success of the sub-region</p> <p>Substantial investment in infrastructure in the sub-region is needed, as well as timely delivery</p> <p>General support for Policy WCBV3 'Infrastructure', but some feeling that this should be made more specific</p>	<p>A detailed schedule of transport and other infrastructure requirements has now been developed to support the sub-regional strategy and work is ongoing by the sub-regional group to refine this. The Sub-regional Investment Framework (see Implementation Plan) sets out the critical pieces of infrastructure required to deliver the sub-regional strategy. Policy WCBV6 makes it clear that future development in the sub-region will be contingent upon securing all necessary supporting infrastructure, reflecting the aims of Policy CC5</p>
Economy	A spectrum of views expressed, ranging from those that felt there is no need to encourage further economic growth in the sub-region, to those supporting the 'managed growth' aspirations of the sub-regional strategy as a pragmatic approach, to those seeking the continued promotion of strong economic growth to help address labour imbalances and ensure the continued competitiveness of the sub-region	<p>A balance needs to be struck between allowing the sub-region to continue its leading role in the economic life of the region and the nation, and not allowing over-development to destroy the very things that made it attractive to business in the first place.</p> <p>Policies WCBV4 and 5 state that priority will be given to recycling and the more efficient use of land already in employment use, and 'smart growth initiatives', but recognise that there may be the need to release a limited number of new sites for employment in certain parts of the sub-region</p>

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Housing	<p>Views about the most appropriate level of housing development for the sub-region varied from no further growth to growth of 40%+ above current RPG9 levels. Generally support for housing levels between RPG9+10% and RPG9-10% as set out in the strategy</p> <p>Representations seeking higher growth often stressed the need to support the continued economic growth of the sub-region. Those seeking lower levels of growth often cited the environment as a limiting factor</p> <p>Strong concerns expressed about the need for affordable and key worker housing, and that the planning system, or simply increasing levels of housebuilding, was not an adequate response to the problem</p>	<p>The Assembly agreed to a figure of 4,490 dwellings per annum for the sub-region. This is approximately equivalent to the current level in RPG9</p> <p>Technical work by the sub-regional group reflects the view that housebuilding alone will not solve the affordable housing problems in the sub-region and that other delivery mechanisms need to be secured. Regional Policy H4 now highlights the need to consider the mechanisms through which affordable housing will be delivered, and the provision of affordable housing is also identified as critical in the Sub-regional Investment Framework</p>
Thames Basin Heaths SPA	<p>Concerns raised about the impact of this designation on the delivery of housing in the sub-region and need for a solution to be found. Support by many for policy WCBV5 but some commented that the potential impact has not been fully tested</p>	<p>Concerns are noted. The Regional Assembly is working with key partners including ODPM, GOSE and English Nature to agree a way forward and assess the potential implications for the South East Plan in time for the Examination in Public</p>

6.7 Central Oxfordshire Sub-regional Strategy

Summary of consultation responses drawn from detailed analysis undertaken by Oxfordshire County Council

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Core Strategy and Scale, Location and Type of Housing	<p>A range of opinions and preferences about whether development should be focused on urban extensions to Oxford (option B), or on the major towns beyond the Green Belt. (option A). Option B would involve development of Green Belt land but be close to Oxford where there is greatest housing need, and where there is good access to services and employment. Option A would avoid Green Belt but require balancing with increased employment opportunities and investment in infrastructure, the lack of which is identified as a problem. There is also concern that they could become dormitory towns</p> <p>A number of respondents called for more development at other locations eg Witney, Shipton quarry, or a "hybrid" of options A and B</p>	<p>The strategy seeks to build on the strengths of the sub-region, particularly in relation to growth in science and technology sectors, while protecting the environment</p> <p>The emphasis on Bicester and Didcot reflects the principal authority's view that the two towns are considered to be well placed to serve as the main focus for development post 2016. These towns are regarded as being relatively free of major constraints with significant employment potential</p>

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Core Strategy and Scale, Location and Type of Housing – continued	<p>Concerns that the scale and distribution of housing will not meet the economic and housing requirements of the sub-region</p> <p>Representations received calling for lower rates of housing development (no more than 1,600 per annum) and higher rates (c.2,000 pa). Concern that lower numbers will not meet need, but higher numbers will put pressure on infrastructure and lead to loss of countryside</p>	<p>The Assembly agreed to development of 1,700 dwellings per annum in the sub-region</p>
Green Belt	<p>Some respondents consider that the Green Belt should be reviewed to accommodate growth close to Oxford, while others believe there must be no review, and its current extent should be protected to safeguard the setting of Oxford</p>	<p>Policy CO3 is consistent with Policy CCI0a in maintaining the existing Green Belt</p>
Affordable Housing	<p>A lot of support for a high target for affordable housing, but concern that 50% target is not achievable and could deter development and increase the price of market housing</p>	<p>Policy CO4 includes a target of 50% to help meet the significant need for affordable housing in the sub-region. District councils will determine amounts to be provided locally</p>
Economy	<p>Concern that the potential of Oxford is not being realised and its economy will suffer. Concerns that Bicester and Didcot will be dormitory towns</p> <p>The need for more emphasis on skills and education was also identified</p>	<p>Policy CO5 seeks balance between addressing the imbalance of employment and workforce in Oxford and maintaining its economic diversity. It seeks to capitalise on the potential of Bicester and Didcot, to increase employment diversity and to improve the balance of workforce and jobs in these communities, and reduce out-commuting. Bicester's position in the Oxford-Cambridge Arc is promoted. The policy includes reference to skills development</p>

Transport and Infrastructure	<p>Transport and infrastructure provision was a major concern of respondents. Concerns centred on inadequate infrastructure in and around Oxford, Bicester and Didcot to deal with current demands, and that further housing and economic growth will increase pressure. Concerns raised over inadequacy of rail links and congestion on major road routes eg A34 through the sub-region. There is consensus over the need for timely provision of infrastructure</p>	<p>A detailed schedule of transport and other infrastructure requirements has been developed to support the sub-regional strategy. This is included in the draft Sub-regional Investment Framework (see Implementation Plan). Policy CO7 requires infrastructure provision in time to meet demands of population</p>
-------------------------------------	---	--

6.8 Milton Keynes and Aylesbury Vale

Summary of consultation responses drawn from detailed analysis undertaken by Buckinghamshire County Council

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Vision and Overall Strategy	<p>A number of respondents sought clarification of the relationship between the Milton Keynes and South Midlands Strategy (MKSM SRS) and the Milton Keynes Long Term Growth Plan. Others questioned the appropriateness of rolling forward just the Milton Keynes and Aylesbury Vale (MKAV) part of the overall MKSM Strategy</p> <p>There is also concern that any expansion of Milton Keynes into Bedfordshire should be addressed through the East of England Plan (RSS14)</p> <p>Some views were expressed that the housing needs and wider role of smaller settlements should be properly addressed in the strategy. Also some concern about the impact of the growth of Aylesbury and Milton Keynes on surrounding rural settlements</p>	<p>The sub-regional strategy for Milton Keynes and Aylesbury Vale has been amended to clarify the relationship between the two processes</p> <p>The MKAV sub-regional strategy in the South East Plan is a roll forward of the MKSM SRS Part B Statement for Milton Keynes and Aylesbury. The Plan confirms that the MKSM SRS Part A Statement remains unchanged</p> <p>The direction of growth of Milton Keynes is subject to further investigation through the Milton Keynes Long Term Growth Study. The outputs of this work will inform relevant Development Plans at regional and local levels. Local Development Frameworks will consider and provide guidance on the role of smaller settlements</p>
Scale and Distribution of Growth	<p>There are differing views on the appropriate level of growth for Milton Keynes, with comments divided between those who support the level set out in the MKSM SRS and those who would like to see a higher level of growth. Others were content with continuing growth at the level in the MKSM SRS as long as the jobs figures in the strategy were not seen as a maximum and a constraint on economic development. Some respondents were concerned that the housing figures in the strategy did not reflect those published in the final Milton Keynes and South Midlands Strategy</p> <p>Some respondents suggested the Plan should specify particular directions for growth around Milton Keynes and Aylesbury</p>	<p>The level of housing growth in the Plan has been brought into line with the final adopted version of the Milton Keynes and South Midlands Strategy for the period 2006-2021. (NB The MKSM SRS was adopted as an amendment to RPG9 during the consultation period on the South East Plan)</p> <p>The employment figures for Aylesbury have been brought into line with the jobs:dwelling ratio employed for Milton Keynes. The employment figures are for monitoring purposes only</p> <p>The direction of growth of individual settlements is a matter for the Local Development Documents</p>

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Communications and Transport	<p>There was some concern that the Sub-regional Strategy should provide clear support for the transport infrastructure needed in the Milton Keynes and Aylesbury Growth Areas. A number of respondents specifically emphasised the importance of reinstating the East West Rail link in this context</p>	<p>A detailed schedule of transport and other infrastructure requirements has been developed to support the sub-regional strategy. This is included in the draft Sub-regional Investment Framework and the Implementation Plan</p>
Infrastructure and Implementation	<p>There were a significant number of comments received expressing concern about the implications of further growth in the sub-region for water supply and water treatment capacity</p> <p>There are serious concerns over the ability of existing infrastructure to support current demands, let alone future growth. Many responses emphasise the need to ensure that infrastructure provision is closely aligned with new development</p> <p>Some responses were keen to stress the importance of the timely provision of all types of infrastructure (hard and soft), including skills, healthcare, green community infrastructure</p>	<p>The need to provide additional water treatment capacity is specifically identified in the Plan</p> <p>A detailed schedule of infrastructure requirements has been developed to support the sub-regional strategy. This is included in the draft Sub-regional Investment Framework in the Implementation Plan. This covers a wide range of infrastructure provision, not solely transport and utilities</p>

6.9 Gatwick Area Sub-region

Summary of consultation responses drawn from detailed analysis undertaken by West Sussex County Council

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Spatial Strategy Scale, Location and Type of Housing Distribution	<p>Development should not be concentrated at one location but spread around sustainable locations in the sub-region. Views on housing density and locations for delivering housing varied, with support for acknowledgement of Crawley's lead role in the sub-region but not suppressing some sustainable growth at other sustainable locations</p> <p>Concerns were raised about how much development can take place on brownfield land given the limited size of the sub-region</p> <p>Views on overall levels of housing varied, but rates lower than, or broadly in line with, current RPG9 levels attracted most support</p>	<p>The proposed sub-regional spatial and housing distribution strategy (Proposed policies GAT1 and GAT2) focuses future development at key locations on transport corridors, in line with sub-regional advice</p> <p>The broad spatial strategy proposed by the sub-regional steering group has been accepted and incorporated into Policy GAT1</p> <p>Proposed future levels of housing delivery in the sub-region are broadly in line with RPG9 (proposed Policy GAT2)</p>

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Green Belt/ Strategic Gaps	<p>Protection of the AONBs around the South Downs and the High Weald were strongly supported</p> <p>Views were expressed concerning the need to ensure water supply and the need to maintain the sub-region's biodiversity</p>	<p>The proposed sub-regional strategy focuses future development at key locations on transport corridors, in line with sub-regional advice. Proposed development levels within the South Downs AONB are kept to a minimum in view of any possible future establishment of a National Park for the South Downs</p> <p>Policy GAT1 seeks to ensure that settlements do not coalesce and that areas of high environmental value are maintained. It also seeks to ensure the integrity of strategic gaps in support of regional policy</p>
Affordable Housing	<p>Support for maintaining and increasing levels of delivering affordable housing in the sub-region</p>	<p>The advice of the sub-regional steering group was accepted, retaining a target of 40% for affordable housing within the sub-region (proposed policy GAT3)</p>
Economy	<p>Smart growth, without increasing pressure for labour was supported, although views varied on the future amounts of employment land that were likely to be required. The need to ensure that towns within the sub-region do not become "dormitory towns" was set out. The essential roles of locations other than Gatwick Airport, and Crawley, should not be lost</p>	<p>Proposed Policy GAT4 focuses on delivering high value economic growth within the sub-region, in line with sub-regional advice, while recognising that future employment locations should focus on the most sustainable locations as identified in proposed Policy GAT1. The key role of Gatwick Airport continues to be acknowledged, along with the need to develop tertiary education facilities in the sub-region</p>
Transport and Infrastructure	<p>There is general agreement that more infrastructure is required in the sub-region to support anticipated growth, including enhanced health and education services, along with sustainable transport measures and improvements to local rail services, but there are concerns about how this may be delivered sustainably</p> <p>All parties agree that the uncertainty surrounding the future plans for Gatwick Airport require resolution. Most views oppose development of a second runway but there was also some support</p>	<p>The Implementation Plan, being developed as part of the South East Plan, will set out the sub-regionally specific measures to be delivered within the timescale of the Plan. Proposed Policy GAT5 forms the enabling policy for delivering infrastructure within the sub-region, focusing on measures such as health, education, transport and water</p> <p>The Regional Transport Strategy sets out the Assembly's position on the future of Gatwick Airport, which supports growth and development within existing planned limits</p>

6.10 Isle of Wight special policy area

Summary of consultation responses drawn from detailed analysis undertaken by Isle of Wight Council

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Strategic Transport Links	<p>There were concerns regarding the strategic transport links from the Isle of Wight to the mainland and that they should be strengthened. Many considered the proposals in the South East Plan did not go far enough to ensure these links are safe-guarded</p>	<p>The strategy seeks to maintain and improve these strategic transport links. Policy IW2 provides for this and has not been changed</p>
Island's Unique Environment	<p>The island's environment is one of the key factors in attracting residents and tourists. This should be preserved at all costs. The South East Plan usefully sets the context for achieving this, though could go further in setting objectives and priorities</p>	<p>The Plan recognises the role of the environment in the island's economy and the environmental designations on the island provide the context for any future development. Setting more detailed objectives and priorities is a matter for the Local Development Framework</p>
Preservation of the Island's Economy	<p>The island's economy is finely balanced and relies heavily on tourism and its environment. This should not be compromised by any development and the aim should be to ensure that the economy of the Isle of Wight is preserved</p>	<p>The development of the island's economy needs to acknowledge the role of tourism, though also needs to look to enabling economic regeneration and inward investment. The strategy aims to achieve both, whilst seeking to secure the long-term future and diversification of the island's economy</p>
Affordable Housing	<p>Many were supportive of providing affordable housing for the island, especially to retain the younger population on the island</p>	<p>The scale of need for affordable housing is acknowledged in the Plan. The target for the island has been set out in Policy H4. The phasing, type and location of the housing is a matter for the Local Development Framework to determine</p>
Infrastructure Pressures	<p>Appropriate infrastructure is critical to the island. Many were concerned over the impact that additional development would have on the island and whether it was able to accommodate additional housing and associated infrastructure. Above all, any further development should not compromise the environmental integrity of the Isle of Wight</p>	<p>Appropriate and timely infrastructure provision is essential to achieving the economic regeneration objective for the island and this is set out in policy IW3. The development of this infrastructure is set out in the sub-regional delivery framework (see Implementation Plan) and will input into the Local Development Framework</p>
Special Policy Area	<p>Many were supportive of the island's special policy area status, though many felt the vision for the island focused too heavily on economic and social considerations at the expense of environmental issues and this needed to be rectified</p>	<p>The Isle of Wight was given special policy status to acknowledge its specific economic and social needs. The strategy seeks to enhance the island's economic performance and improve associated social issues, within the context that the environment is a fundamental asset and will be a key influence on the island's future development</p>



Principal Authorities' Consultation